

Indiana Professional Standards Board

Frank L. O'Bannon, Governor Marie Theobald, Ed.D. Executive Director

101 W. Ohio Street-Suite 300 Indianapolis, IN 46204-1953 Telephone: (317) 232-9010 Toll free: (866) 542-3672 Fax: (317) 232-9023 www.in.gov/psb

TO: Members, Indiana Professional Standards Board

FROM: John Marsteller, Chair

Teacher Education Committee

DATE: September 17, 2003

RE: Minutes of June 6, 2003 Meeting

Members Present: John Marsteller, Steve Holtrop, Callie Marksbary, Ena Shelley, Judy

Briganti, Marilyn Watkins, Pat Swails

Staff Present: Mary Glenn Rinne

Others Present: Kam Chi, Chan, Jackie Covault, David Pratt, Cynthia Fontaine,

Ken Schoon, John Somers, Ed Wall, Kathy Moran, Beverly Reitsma,

Carolyn Babione

I. Consultations with representatives of education stakeholders: Discussions are explained below under New Program Proposals.

II. Approval of April 11, 2003 Minutes

Judy Briganti moved and Ena Shelley seconded the approval of the minutes as written. Unanimous

III. Purdue—North Central – Preconditions

A team of faculty from Purdue—North Central, lead by Dr. Cynthia Fontaine met with the TEC to address any questions/comments offered by the TEC. Each precondition was considered and a vote was taken on each.

A. Precondition #1

Pat Swails moved and Marilyn Watkins seconded approval of this precondition. Unanimous

B. Precondition #2

Pat Swails moved and Judy Briganti seconded approval of this precondition. Unanimous

C. Precondition #3

Pat Swails moved and Ena Shelley seconded approval of this precondition. Unanimous

D. Precondition #4

Judy Briganti moved and Marilyn seconded approval of this precondition with suggestions for clarification. Unanimous

- 1. Cynthia Fontaine explained that the North Central Campus is not offering the Master's degree program under its auspices. This remains under West Lafayette's purview. Also, documentation was provided about the Transition-to-Teaching program structure.
- 2. The word "current" needs to be changed or eliminated.
- 3. The SAT/ACT minimum score needs to be identified.
- 4. A caution was given regarding the legal issues surrounding "critical friends" and boundaries established for this group
- 5. There is a need to explain the process of pulling a candidate from the program when the need arises.

E. Precondition #5

Marilyn Watkins moved and Pat Swails seconded approval of this precondition with suggestions for clarification. Unanimous

- 1. Clarification is needed between "B" and "C" on roles. Perhaps merge the
- 2. Include critical points where "red flags" need to be considered

F. Precondition #6

Callie Marksbary moved and Pat Swails seconded approval of this precondition with a suggestion for clarification. Unanimous

1. Establish a plan for monitoring the diversity of field experiences.

G. Precondition #7

Pat Swails moved and Judy Briganti seconded approval of this precondition. Unanimous

H. Precondition #8

Judy Briganti moved and Marilyn Watkins seconded approval of this precondition. Unanimous

I. Precondition #9

Marilyn Watkins moved and Judy Briganti seconded approval of this precondition. Unanimous

IV. New Program Proposal

- A. Indiana University—Northwest Visual Arts Education
 Ken Schoon discussed the new program proposal with the TEC. Callie
 Marksbary moved and Pat Swails seconded approval of this new program.
 Unanimous
- B. University of Indianapolis Social Studies--Geographical Perspectives A faculty team was present to respond to questions/comments from the TEC. Callie Marksbary moved and Judy Briganti seconded approval of this new program. Unanimous

- C. University of Indianapolis Educational Leadership
 Several faculty from this advanced level program were present to respond to
 questions/comments from the TEC. Pat Swails moved and Steve Holtrop
 seconded approval of this new program. Unanimous
- D. Indiana University—Southeast Gifted and Talented
 Carolyn Babione represented the institution in the discussion of this program
 proposal with the TEC. Marilyn Watkins moved and Ena Shelley seconded
 approval of this new program. Unanimous
- E. Marian College Middle School

There was no representative from this institution present for the discussion of this new program. (It was later determined that the email Mary Glenn sent to the chair did not specifically state the need for her attendance at the TEC meeting.) Judy Briganti moved and Pat Swails seconded approval of this program, contingent upon the Chair answering the minor concerns listed below. Unanimous

- 1. Standards 1 and 2: Is the uniqueness of the middle school student addressed throughout the program?
- 2. Standard 1: Right before the Standard 2 text begins, there is a statement of how you will meet content standards. Everything is written in the future tense. What will you actually be doing?
- 3. In EDU 455, what is the "behavior analysis?"
- 4. Standard 2: What is the proposed course of study and the length of time required to complete the program? Are you comfortable with the time commitment when recruiting candidates for this program?
- 5. Standard 2: The EDU 168 course description and matrix do not align. This may be true for other courses, as well.
- 6. You are to be commended for offering this program, as many institutions are dropping this Middle School level program.
- 7. From an accrediting perspective, there is some concern about having most of the courses for this area taught by only one faculty person.
- F. University of Southern Indiana Educational Leadership
 There was no representative from this institution present for the discussion of this
 new program. The proposal was discussed by the TEC and each Standard
 addressed separately.
 - 1. Standard 1: Callie Marksbary moved and Pat Swails seconded approval of this standard. Unanimous
 - 2. Standard 2: Pat Swails moved and Marilyn Watkins seconded the motion that this standard be considered as unmet. Unanimous
 - a. Need to list reflection opportunities.
 - b. Need actual course descriptions.
 - c. Need more in-
 - d. depth explanation on synthesis of experiences with theory

- e. What are the experiences?
- f. Describe the diversity of these experiences
- g. Need to explain how program outcome evaluation is done. (written assessment plan, who is responsible, who records, what criteria is used, what assessments required—could be presented in graphic form)
- h. How do you assess the conceptual framework for the program? Is the conceptual framework different from the initial level program?
- i. On page 7, you need a scope and sequence of the program
- j. Admission criteria are not clear
- k. Is the internship all day for 10 weeks?
- 1. What is the knowledge base for the program?
- m. How is the candidate assessed?
- n. Need a unit assessment system for this advanced level program.
- 3. Standard 3: Marilyn Watkins moved and Callie Marksbary seconded the motion that this standard be considered as unmet. Unanimous
 - a. Diversity of field experiences need to be delineated.
 - b. Explain how field experiences are being tracked.
 - c. Clarify length and quality of field experiences (page 8).
 - d. How do field experiences support the coursework?
 - e. Define the supervision provide for field experiences. How often does "occasional" mean?
 - f. Is one university supervisor for all candidates sufficient?
 - g. What is the role of the coordinator? Is it the same as the Director of the program? (page 8)
 - h. Clarify who are serving as faculty of this program and who is the administrator of this program.
- 4. Standard 4: Marilyn Watkins moved and Pat Swails seconded the motion that this standard be considered as unmet. Unanimous
 - a. Detail is needed related to criteria for acceptance into program, how "red flags" are determined, appeals process, formative and summative points
 - b. This standard is written in a very vague manner.
 - c. A timeline needs to be developed
 - d. A UAS flowchart is needed.
 - e. Define the internship
 - f. How are assessment rubrics validated?
 - g. Is the SLLA score the only exit criteria?
 - h. What is the length of the program?
- 5. Standard 5: John Holtrop moved and Callie Marksbary seconded the tabling of this standard due to missing information. Unanimous
 - a. Provide the educational leadership credentials of the director of the program.

- 6. Standard 6: Callie moved and Pat Swails seconded the tabling of this standard due to missing information. Unanimous
 - a. Explain the fiscal resources supporting the program.
 - b. Add an organizational chart to explain the governance structure
 - c. Can the program make changes it may need to make?
- 7. Standard 7: Marilyn Watkins moved and Steve Holtrop seconded the tabling of this standard due to missing information. Unanimous
 - a. Description of the cohort needed.
 - b. Graduation date?
- 8. Standard 8: Callie Marksbary moved and Pat Swails seconded the motion that this standard be considered as unmet. Unanimous
 - a. Where is the UAS component?

V. Accreditation

- 1. Indiana University—Bloomington/IUPUI
- 2. St. Mary's College
- 3. Indiana University—Kokomo
- 4. Indiana Wesleyan University

Judy Briganti moved and Steve Holtrop seconded the motion to recommend accreditation of each of these institutions as determined by NCATE's UAB. Unanimous

VI. New Program Proposal

- 1. IUN-Art Education
- 2. University of Indianapolis Social Studies--Geographical Perspectives
- 3. University of Indianapolis Educational Leadership
- 4. IUS Gifted and Talented
- 5. Marian College Middle School
- 6. University of Southern Indiana Master's Degree in Educ. Leadership

VII. TEC/Institution Relationships

The concept of assigning institutions to each TEC member was discussed to enable a stronger liaison relationship between the TEC and the teacher preparation units. Each member signed up to work with specific units for next year to oversee UAS Review reports, October 15th annual reports and Low Performing status, where necessary.

VIII. Committee Member Commitment and Meeting Dates for Next Year
All members present committed to serving on the TEC for the next academic year.
The following meeting dates were set:

September 5 October 10 November 14 January 16 March 5 May 14

June 11

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 PM